



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,488	04/30/2001	Anjana Agarwal	11-4-1	2350

22046 7590 05/13/2004

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR  
101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219  
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,488

Applicant(s)

AGARWAL ET AL.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. VERKAMA et al., Adamany et al., Boltz, Tomoike, Talagery, Koster, Nguyen, Mukerjee et al.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Hanson (US 6516194).

1. Regarding claim 1, Hanson disclosed A method for preventing delivery of calls to a mobile unit that is roaming from an originating system to a serving system, the originating system

Art Unit: 2683

including an originating mobile switching center (MSC) and the serving system including a serving MSC (106; fig.2), the method comprising the steps of:

registering the mobile unit with the serving MSC, the registration including a termination restriction code parameter; (col.10; 9-18) and

denying termination of a call to the mobile unit while roaming at the serving MSC when the termination restriction code parameter indicates that the mobile unit is not permitted to terminate calls at the serving MSC. (col.10; 39-48 & 59-65)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (US 6516194) in view of Talagery (US 6044269).

2. Regarding claim 2, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting a call termination when a Roamer Access Number (RAN) call is attempted without requiring subsequent messaging to determine if the mobile unit has RAN permissions (col.10; 9-18), the method comprising the steps of:

the termination restriction code indicating whether the mobile unit can terminate roamer port call requests; (col.10;18-22)

receiving a RAN call request; and denying by the serving MSC of the roamer port call request if the termination restriction code indicates that the mobile unit is not allowed to terminate roamer port call requests. (col.10; 39-48 & 59-65)

Hanson fails to disclosed passing a termination restriction code from a home location register (HLR) to a serving MSC. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that passing a termination restriction code from a home location register (HLR) to a serving MSC. (col.3; 49-60 & 1-11) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include passing a termination restriction code from a home location register (HLR) to a serving MSC in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

3. Regarding claim 3, Hanson disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the step of passing the termination restriction code from the HLR to the serving MSC occurs during registration of

Art Unit: 2683

the mobile unit with the serving MSC. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that A method for restricting a call termination in accordance with claim 2, wherein the step of passing the termination restriction code from the HLR to the serving MSC occurs during registration of the mobile unit with the serving MSC. (col.3; 49-60 & 1-11) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include passing a termination restriction code from the HLR to a serving MSC in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

4. Regarding claim 4, Hanson disclosed all the particulars of the claim except the step of passing the termination restriction code from the HLR to the serving MSC occurs in response to a request from the serving MSC to the HLR. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that A method for restricting a call termination in accordance with claim 2, wherein the step of passing the termination restriction code from the HLR to the serving MSC occurs in response to a request from the serving MSC to the HLR. (col.3; 49-60 & 1-11) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the step of passing the termination restriction code from the HLR to the serving MSC occurs in response to a request from the serving MSC to the HLR in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

5. Regarding claim 5, Hanson disclosed all the particulars of the claim except a roamer port. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that A method for restricting a call termination in accordance with claim 4, wherein the request from the serving MSC to the HLR occurs prior to the serving MSC receiving a roamer port call request for the mobile unit. (col.3; 49-60 & 1-11)

Art Unit: 2683

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a roamer port in order to provide preferred list of mobile call delivery.

6. Regarding claim 6, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in communication with a serving Mobile Switching Center (MSC) (106; fig.2), the method comprising:

receiving at the serving MSC a call request for the roaming mobile unit; (transmits a MIN... 106; col.10; 9-16)

if the call request was received via a roamer port on the serving MSC, determining if the roaming mobile unit has a service profile stored at the serving MSC; (col.10; 17-22)

if the roaming mobile unit has a service profile at the serving MSC, retrieving a termination restriction code associated with the roaming mobile unit; (col.10; 33-39) and

if the termination restriction code is set to allow roamer port access calls, terminating the call request at the roaming mobile unit. (col.10; 39-48)

Hanson fails to disclosed determining if the call request has been received for a roamer port on the serving MSC. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that determining if the call request has been received for a roamer port on the serving MSC. (col.3; 49-60 & 1-11)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include determining if the call request has been received for a roamer port on the serving MSC in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

Art Unit: 2683

7. Regarding claim 7, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 6, wherein the step of receiving a call request for the roaming mobile unit comprises the step of receiving a call request for a prepaid call. (prepaid; col.6; 4-18)

8. Regarding claim 8, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 6, further comprising the step of receiving the service profile at the serving MSC from a home MSC. (col.10; 26-34)

9. Regarding claim 9, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 8, wherein the service profile is received by the serving MSC at the time the roaming mobile unit registers with the serving MSC. (col.10; 9-16)

10. Regarding claim 10, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 9, wherein the service profile includes a termination restriction code. (termination restriction code; col.10; 37-48)

11. Regarding claim 11, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 8, wherein the service profile is received by the serving MSC in response to a request by the serving MSC. (col.10; 9-16)



Art Unit: 2683

12. Regarding claim 12, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 11, wherein the service profile includes a termination restriction code. (termination restriction code; col.10; 37-48)

13. Regarding claim 13, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 11, wherein the serving MSC requests the service profile at a time when a call is not incoming for the roaming mobile unit. (col.10; 9-16)

14. Regarding claim 14, Hanson disclosed all the particulars of the claim except if the mobile unit does not have a service profile present at the serving MSC, performing an initiating qualification function. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 6, further comprising the step of, if the mobile unit does not have a service profile present at the serving MSC, performing an initiating qualification function. (TLDN; col.3; 49-60 & 1-11) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include if the mobile unit does not have a service profile present at the serving MSC, performing an initiating qualification function in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

15. Regarding claim 15, Hanson disclosed A method for restricting call terminations for a roaming mobile unit in accordance with claim 6, further comprising the step of denying the call request if the termination restriction code is not set to allow roamer port access calls. (col.10; 59-65)

Art Unit: 2683

16. Regarding claim 16, Hanson disclosed A mobile switching center (106; fig.2), comprising:

means for receiving a call request for a roaming mobile unit registered with the mobile switching center; (transmits a MIN... 106; col.10; 9-16)

means for determining if the roaming mobile unit has a service profile stored at the mobile switching center if the call request was received for a roamer port on the mobile switching center; (col.10; 17-22)

means for retrieving a termination restriction code associated with the roaming mobile unit if the roaming mobile unit has a service profile at the mobile switching center; (col.10; 33-39) and

means for terminating the call request at the roaming mobile unit if the termination restriction code is set to allow roamer port access calls. (col.10; 39-48)

Hanson fails to disclosed means for determining if the call request has been received for a roamer port on the mobile switching center. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that means for determining if the call request has been received for a roamer port on the mobile switching center. (col.3; 49-60 & 1-11) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include means for determining if the call request has been received for a roamer port on the mobile switching center in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

Art Unit: 2683

17. Regarding claim 17, Hanson disclosed A mobile switching center in accordance with claim 16, wherein the means for receiving a call request for the roaming mobile unit comprises means for receiving a call request for a prepaid call. (prepaid; col.6; 4-18)

18. Regarding claim 18, Hanson disclosed A mobile switching center in accordance with claim 16, further comprising means for receiving the service profile at the mobile switching center from a home MSC. (col.10; 26-34)

19. Regarding claim 19, Hanson disclosed all the particulars of the claim except if the mobile unit does not have a service profile present at the serving MSC, performing an initiating qualification function. However, Talagery teaches in an analogous art, that A mobile switching center in accordance with claim 16, further comprising means for performing an initiating qualification function if the mobile unit does not have a service profile present at the serving MSC. (TLDN; col.3; 49-60 & 1-11) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include if the mobile unit does not have a service profile present at the serving MSC, performing an initiating qualification function in order to provide enhanced control of mobile call delivery.

20. Regarding claim 20, Hanson disclosed A mobile switching center in accordance with claim 16, further comprising means for denying the call request if the termination restriction code is not set to allow roamer port access calls. (col.10; 59-65)

Art Unit: 2683

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Sharad Rampuria  
May 7, 2004



WILLIAM TROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600